

REMARKS

1 Claims 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, and 25 have been deemed to be allowable.
The applicants appreciate the Examiner's assistance in obtaining the same.

5 The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,419,223 to Morin in view of U.S.
Patent No. 6,165,323, to Shearer. Likewise, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§103(a) over Morin and Shearer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,082,555. The
applicants disagree with these rejections. However, claim 1 has been amended to
depend from claim 25, which has been allowed. The language of claim 1 has been
10 changed to simply recite the limitations of the pivotably mounted solids screen, which
has not heretofore been used with systems for producing liquid compositions as
claimed. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct from the prior art and
the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and allow the same.

15 Claims 2, 4, 5 and 6 each ultimately depend from claims 1 and 25 and are
believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to claims 1
and 25. Moreover, claim 5 specifically defines the manner in which the solids screen is
coupled with the system and the access to system components granted thereby, which
has not heretofore been used with systems for producing liquid compositions as
20 claimed. Claim 6 is further limited by defining the shape and size of the lower end of
the hopper and the open upper end of the receiving tank to be received by a collection
bucket coupled with a mobile vehicle. The nature of this language has not changed
since the previous Amendment filed by the applicants. Accordingly, the Examiner's

1 rejection is inappropriate to the extent that it remains based on the previously used
"adapted to" language, which no longer remains in the claim.

5 The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,510,114 to Nelson. The Examiner rejected claim
21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in further view of
10 U.S. Patent No. 5,775,237 to Reilly, et al. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103
over Nelson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,863,277 to Neal, et al. The Examiner states
that the Nelson reference teaches all of the structural limitations within the claims
except for the receiving tank having an opening formed at a lower end thereof.
Specifically, the Examiner argues that the Nelson reference discloses an elongated
15 spray bar that rotates about a longitudinal axis thereof. However, the Examiner's
argument is not accurate. The spray bar 286 in Nelson is coupled to an arm, which is in
turn mounted on a rotating axle coupled to the motor 288. Accordingly, rotation in the
nelson device is about an axis extending through the axle of the motor 288, leaving the
20 spray bar 286 and mounting arm to move arcuately about the axle. Such a motion is
not as claimed and creates a structurally and functionally different spray pattern and
mode of operation. Accordingly, the Examiner's argument that it would have been
obvious to a person of skill in the art to simply provide an opening at the lower end of
the tank for a gravity discharge is moot in view of the fact that the system claimed by the
applicants is different from that disclosed in the art. Moreover, a person of ordinary skill
25 in the art who was looking to create a novel and more efficient system for producing
liquid compositions as claimed would not, on any objective basis look to the teachings

of Nelson, which teaches a method of making an ice cube maker. Accordingly, claim 7
is patentably distinct from the prior art and the examiner is respectfully requested to
reconsider and allow the same.


Claims 9, 13, 20, 21 and 22 each ultimately depend from claim 7 and are
believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to claim 7.
Moreover, applicants believe the Examiner has misconstrued claim 13, which claims
oscillating nozzles on the rotating spray bar, thus providing a double action. The
Examiner's rejection focuses only on the moving spray bar of Nelson, which does not
further include oscillating nozzles. Moreover, claim 20 is further limited by defining the
shape and size of the lower end of the hopper and the open upper end of the receiving
tank to be received by a collection bucket coupled with a mobile vehicle. The nature of
this language has not changed since the previous Amendment filed by the applicants.
Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is inappropriate to the extent that it remains based
on the previously used "adapted to" language, which no longer remains in the claim.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant asserts that each of the
pending claims is believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly,
applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this
amendment; however, please consider this a request for any extension inadvertently
omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 502093.



Respectfully submitted,




SHANE M. NIEBERGALL

Registration No. 44,974
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL
Attorneys of Record

2120 S. 72nd Street, Suite 1111
Omaha, NE 68124
(402) 392-2280

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the original of this AMENDMENT for JAMES A. HELLBUSH,
ET AL., Serial No. 09/970,594, was mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, to Mail
Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
1450 on this 6th day of January, 2006.



SHANE M. NIEBERGALL